



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/580,061

02/20/2007

Peisheng Cao

14556.0007USWO

7583

23552 7590 07/18/2008

MERCHANT & GOULD PC

P.O. BOX 2903

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

LEITH, PATRICIA A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1655

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/18/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/580,061	Applicant(s) CAO, PEISHENG	
	Examiner Patricia Leith	Art Unit 1655	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Patricia Leith. (3)_____.

(2) Attorney Tong Wu. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 16 July 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: proposed amendment (faxed to examiner).

Claim(s) discussed: 1-4 and 27.

Identification of prior art discussed: Wang, Bloom, Soinneae, P.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Patricia Leith/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1655

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: It is first noted claim 27 is a newly proposed claim sent with the proposed claim amendment faxed to the examiner on 7/14/2008. Mr. Wu indicates that the inventor gives a detailed theory of the claimed invention thereby obviating the rejection under 35 USC 112 first paragraph. Examiner indicated that the language in the claim which states "obtaining a extract which contains the active components of the Chinese traditional medicine or plant" lacks written description because applicant has not provided a reasonable indication that the method would predictably provide for the active components of a representative number of Chinese traditional medicines. Examiner indicated however, that if the claims were broadly directed toward just extraction of plant matter without the indication that active components will be extracted will overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112 first paragraph, however, there is still the issue of the outstanding 35 USC 112 second rejection over the claims due to the recitation of Chinese traditional medicine. Mr. Wu proposed amending claim 1 to recite 'plants' instead of Chinese traditional medicines/plants, however, indicated that this may be new matter however full consideration of the claimed invention would be undertaken when the claims are entered into the record. With regard to the 'approximate' values as cited in claim 1 for example with the '~' symbol, Mr. Wu indicated that these '~' would be replaced by dashes ('-'). Indicated that this change would need to be evaluated for new matter if amended to incorporate the dashes. Mr. Wu also pointed out that the PCT prior to translation did not have the '~' symbols in the claim; but rather, that the claims had dashes '-'. This will be evaluated more closely when a reply to the office action is submitted on the record. With regard to the 103 rejection, Mr. Wu indicated that the specification makes clear that the vibration and pressure limitations are performed simultaneously. Mr. Wu also indicated that the claims may be amended to recite that the pressure/vibration is performed simultaneously. Communicated to Mr. Wu that this also would need to be evaluated for new matter and re-evaluated with regard to the prior art. Mr. Wu indicated that the examiner's statement that even linear vibration will have non-linear vibration is not consistent with the understanding of 'nonlinear vibration' as it is understood in the art. Mr. Wu stated that applicant actually means that the vibration is carried out at two frequencies. Communicated that any relevant arguments pertaining to the recitation of 'nonlinear vibration' and the meaning thereof in the prior art will be fully considered if placed on the record. Lastly, claim 27, as added in the draft proposed amendment faxed to the examiner on 7/14/08. This claim further limits claim 1 to wherein the step of extraction is performed with a particular apparatus. Communicated to Mr. Wu that if this claim is added in the next amendment, it will more than likely be examined since it is a dependent claim and will be considered on its merits .